

Academic Misconduct Policy

APPROVED BY Academic Board and SELT

Applies to:	
Harrogate College	X
Keighley College	X
Leeds City College	
Leeds Conservatoire	X
White Rose Academies Trust	
University Centre Leeds	X

CHANGE CONTROL

Version:	1	
Approved by:	Academic Board SELT	
Date approved:	September 2020	
Name of author:	Admissions	
Name of responsible committee:	Academic Board	
Related policies: (list)		
Equality impact assessment completed	Date:	September
	Assessment type	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Full <input type="checkbox"/> Part <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not required	
Policy will be communicated via:	Website, VLE	
Next review date:	December 2026	

Contents

- 1. INTRODUCTION 4
- 2. PRINCIPLES AND UNDERPINNING VALUES 4
- 3. FORMS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT 5
- 4. REVIEW 8



1. INTRODUCTION

For the purpose of this Policy, University Centre Leeds (incorporating campuses at Mabgate, Park Lane, Printworks and Quarry Hill, as well as HE provision at Keighley College and Harrogate College) and Leeds Conservatoire will be known as 'The Provider'.

All students at our university are expected to maintain a high degree of academic integrity.

This policy outlines Luminare's expectations regarding academic integrity. It is intended to foster a learning environment that values honesty, fairness, and respect for intellectual property and academic rigour.

- **Academic integrity** is a positive commitment to approaching academic work in a way that is honest, fair, respectful and responsible, and is a fundamental value in higher education. Academic integrity is a component of academic rigour.
- To ensure that academic integrity standards are upheld, all work submitted for an assessment is expected to be the student's or students' own independent work. It must not be work that has been submitted for another assessment either at Luminare or elsewhere. When working with others, or when presenting other people's work as part of an assessment, this must be fully acknowledged and credit given to all contributors.
- **Academic misconduct** is therefore considered to be any act that compromises the integrity of the academic process, and/or has the potential to gain an unfair advantage for a student or group of students in a formal assessment.
- This policy sets out our approach to managing suspected academic misconduct and outlines the consequences for breaching these standards in line with our principles and underpinning values described below

2. PRINCIPLES AND UNDERPINNING VALUES

- It is essential to protect and maintain assessment standards, the value of the University's awards and the reputation for academic excellence.
- Luminare will be bound by any relevant legislation or regulatory obligations relevant to the policy, process and practice in this area.
- We are fair and transparent with students and we seek to educate them to understand how to correct poor academic practice.
- Students suspected of academic misconduct must be informed in clear terms of;
 - The specific breach of academic misconduct.
 - The process to establish whether a breach has occurred including how they can respond to the allegation and present any information, explanation or mitigating circumstances they feel are relevant.
 - The support available to them during and after the process.
 - Any penalty given and how it will be applied.
 - The right to appeal and how to do so.
 - Suspected breaches will be dealt with promptly, thoroughly and fairly.
 - Cases should be concluded within a reasonable timeframe, and not exceeding 30 working days of notification of the suspected breach to the student.
 - Where this is not possible students should be kept regularly informed.
 - All relevant evidence must be provided to the student.

3. FORMS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to:

- **False Authorship** wherein authorship is claimed for work that was not solely or substantially created by the individual submitting it. This can take various forms, including:
 - Plagiarism
 - Contracting cheating
 - Collusion
 - Ghost authorship, where individuals who made significant contributions to the work are excluded from the authorship list
 - Gift authorship, where individuals are included on the authorship list who did not contribute significantly to the work
 - Automated authorship, involving the inappropriate/unsanctioned use of Artificial Intelligence.
- **Plagiarism (either intentional or unintentional):** using the ideas or work of another person and submitting them as the student's own.
- **Self-Plagiarism:** submitting work that has already been submitted for another assessment, without acknowledgement, or express authorisation by an academic tutor. This may take the form of copying either the whole piece of work or part of it.
- **Fabrication:** submitting work (for example, data, evidence or experimental results) which is untrue, made up, falsified or fabricated in any way.
- **Collusion:** working with others to produce a piece of work, all or part of which is then submitted by each student as their own individual work without acknowledgement. This includes passing on work in any format to another student. It also includes sharing answers with other students or obtaining answers from others.
- **Impersonation:** arranging for someone else to impersonate a student by undertaking their assessment, for example, sitting their examination.
- **Contract cheating:** submitting bought or commissioned work from a third party, including essay mills, other students, friends or family members. This may take the form of buying or commissioning either the whole piece of work or part of it.
- **Facilitating the use of unfair means:** assisting a fellow student in using any of the forms of academic misconduct defined above, for example in submitting bought or commissioned work. The University takes an extremely serious view of any student who sells, offers to sell or passes on their own assessed work to other students.
- **Cheating in examinations:** Using unauthorised materials or methods to complete assignments or exams. This includes using notes, books, or electronic devices during exams or assignments without permission.

Academic Misconduct Procedure (Plagiarism, Collusion & Contract Cheating):

Stage 1 – potential academic misconduct is identified by the marker/examiner:

- Marker/examiner determines poor academic practice, addresses this in feedback and signposts to support, or
- Marker/examiner alleges academic misconduct and refers for investigation.

Stage 2 – referral for investigation

- Marker/examiner completes the Allegation of Academic Misconduct Form and sends it to the Academic Registrar with the relevant assignment brief and supporting evidence with 20 working days of the assignment deadline. The Academic Registrar quality-checks the information and forwards it to the relevant Head of School for investigation.

- Marker/examiner includes the following information under 'Submission information' on SPACE: Grade pending following academic misconduct referral. This ensures that the student is made aware of why they cannot view their feedback and marks when feedback for the module is formally released.
- The Head of School will decide whether there is a case to answer. If there is no case to answer the student and marker/examiner will be informed and advised accordingly.

Stage 3 – case to answer

- If there is a case to answer, action will be taken by relevant Head of School in accordance with the University of Hull's *Regulations Governing Academic Misconduct*.

Examples of Academic Misconduct include:

- Plagiarism
- Self-Plagiarism
- Collusion
- Cheating in an exam
- Contract cheating
- Fabrication or falsification of data

In contrast to academic misconduct such as plagiarism and collusion, it can often prove difficult to obtain evidence of academic misconduct for work submitted for assessment which has been performed or created by other persons or through the commissioning of third parties. However, it is still important to investigate these cases. In such circumstances, the following information should act as guidance and should be followed in conjunction with the Academic Misconduct Procedure – Initial Guide (Plagiarism, collusion or contract cheating).

Responsibility of Markers/Examiners

Markers/examiners have the responsibility to refer to the Academic Registrar any work submitted for assessment they suspect as having been performed or created by other persons or by commissioning third parties. This should be done in accordance with the Academic Misconduct Procedure – Initial Guide (Plagiarism, collusion or contract cheating).

Responsibility of Academic Misconduct Officer (Head of School)

It is responsibility of the Academic Misconduct Officer (the relevant Head of School as appropriate) to investigate the allegation of academic misconduct by reviewing the information available and presenting the case to an adjudicating panel. Information available can include material related to the specific piece of work in question, as well as examples of previous work submitted by the student to consider any marked disparity in the quality of writing with the piece of work under investigation. The likely test of the student will be a 'viva-style' session before the Adjudicating Panel to test whether the student can articulate proper understanding of the material expressed in their submitted work.

Responsibility of Adjudicating Panel

The Adjudicating Panel will meet to review the information available following the investigation by the Academic Misconduct Officer, as well as the testimony of the student who will be invited to attend the hearing.

The verdict will be at the discretion of the panel hearing the case and can be judged on the balance of probabilities as to whether it believes the student has committed the offence. A judgement can be made by majority vote if necessary.

Marker / Examiner

- Suspects work submitted for assessment has been performed or created by others persons or by commissioning third parties
- Allegation of academic misconduct made to Academic Registrar.

Academic Misconduct Officer

- Investigates allegation of academic misconduct by reviewing the information available
- Presents case to Adjudicating Panel

Adjudicating Panel

- Reviews information made available from Academic Misconduct Officer's investigation
- Hears testimony of student in 'viva-style' session
- Reaches verdict (by majority vote if necessary)

Academic Misconduct (Exam Room Breaches)

Stage 1 – potential academic misconduct is identified by the invigilator. The invigilator must:

- Confiscate any contraband materials and issue a receipt (any confiscated mobile phones will be available for collection immediately following the examination).
- Annotate the examination booklet.
- Complete an Academic Misconduct Form.
- Complete their Invigilator's Report.
- Submit relevant documentation the Academic Registrar

Stage 2 – referral for investigation

- Invigilator completes the Allegation of Academic Misconduct Form and Invigilator's Report and sends it to the Academic Registrar within 10 working days of the examination. The Academic Registrar quality-checks the information and forwards it to the Head of School for investigation.
- The Head of Registry will decide whether there is a case to answer. If there is no case to answer the student and invigilator will be informed and advised accordingly.

Stage 3 – case to answer

- If there is a case to answer, action will be taken by relevant Head of Registry in accordance with the University of Hull's Regulations Governing Academic Misconduct.

Process Flowchart (Academic Misconduct Procedure (Plagiarism, Collusion & Contract Cheating & Exam Room Breaches):

Stage 1 - potential academic misconduct identified by marker/examiner

Poor academic practice: address in feedback (no further action taken)	Sufficient to warrant referral: refer to Academic Registrar
--	---



Stage 2 - referral quality-checked by Academic Registrar before investigation by the relevant Head of School

No case to answer (no further action taken)	Case to answer (further action required)
---	--



Stage 3 - action taken by the relevant Head of School in accordance with University of Hull's Regulations Governing Academic Misconduct

4. REVIEW

Owner: Registry

Introduced:

Last review: February 2025

Next Review: December 2026

The Provider reserves the right to review the policy at any time.

Change Summary		
Version	Date	Summary of Changes